### Part I is the Harms

Gun violence devastates minority communities. It is the number one cause of death for black youth, destroying families, causing psychological damage, and spurring police militarization, **Kaplan et al. ‘13:**

https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/race/news/2013/01/17/49885/top-10-reasons-why-communities-of-color-should-care-about-stricter-gun-violence-prevention-laws 1/17/13 ZP/

Acts of **gun violence take[s] approximately 30,000** American **lives every year, and** gun violence is one of the leading causes of death among teens. Although the majority of these shootings rarely make national headlines, the tragedy is no less real. As the following facts show, communities and families of color disproportionately suffer from gun violence. Here are 10 reasons why communities of color have a great stake in the public discourse on violence prevention. 1. People of color account for the majority of gun-violence victims. There are large racial disparities in homicide rates due to gun violence. The gun-homicide rate for black males is 2.4 times as high as that of Latino males, and it is 15.3 times as high as the rate for non-Hispanic white males. Murder and non-negligent manslaughter victims are most frequently black or Latino, with blacks comprising 67 percent of victims and Latinos comprising 28.1 percent. Blacks make up roughly 13 percent of the U.S. population, but in 2010—the last year for which data is available—they suffered 56 percent of all firearm homicides. 2. Gun violence **is one of the leading causes of death for teens of color.** Guns cause the deaths of thousands of teens each year. In 2008 and 2009 gun homicide was the leading cause of death among black teens, and the rates of gun-related deaths are highest for black male teens. For black families, the chance of a male child dying from a gunshot wound is 62 percent higher than the chance of him dying in a motor-vehicle crash. In 2010 American Indian male teens had the second-highest rate of gun-related deaths, with 19.3 gun-related deaths per 100,000 teens. Latino male teens followed, with 17.8 per 100,000. In contrast,white male teens had the second-lowest rate, with only 9.4 per 100,000. 3. Gun violence is a vicious cycle. **Teens exposed** to gun violence **are more likely to commit violence** in the future. In a study conducted by the Department of Justice, teens were interviewed over a number of years about their exposure to violence, as well as their own violent acts. Teens who had been exposed to firearms violence reported committing more serious acts of violence than teens who had not been exposed. Additionally, youth who live in dangerous and disadvantaged neighborhoods and have had more exposure to violence were found to be more likely to carry concealed firearms. This means that **communities** already facing high levels of gun violence will likely **continue to experience violence** unless policymakers take action. 4. Gun injuries disproportionately affect communities of color. Of the 34,347 children and teens who suffered gun injuries in the United States in 2008 and 2009, almost half were black, and more than one-fifth were Latino. Black teens alone are 25 times more likely to be injured by a gun than white teens. 5. People of color strongly support gun-violence prevention. As people of color suffer higher rates of gun violence, it is not surprising that they strongly support stricter gun laws. Forty-nine percent of people of color are in favor of stricter gun-violence prevention. 6. The militarization of school safety and orderliness most heavily impacts children of color. In the wake of recent school shootings, members of the National Rifle Association, the nation’s largest gun lobby, have suggested putting armed police officers in every school. But research shows that increased **police** presence in schools **disproportionately affect**s **youth of color, driving the school-to-prison pipeline** and leading to youths’ unnecessary involvement in the justice system. Studies have shown that the more interaction a young person has with the criminal justice system, the more likely they are to come into contact with the criminal justice system in the future. This dynamic works to push a disproportionate number of black and Latino students out of school and into the criminal justice system. Black boys in particular are three times more likely to be suspended than white boys, and black girls are four times more likely to be suspended than white girls. 7. **Gun violence is concentrated in urban** and **poor neighborhoods,** which tend to be populated predominately by people of color. In 2006 and 2007 the 62 center cities of America’s 50 largest metro areas accounted for only 15 percent of the population but 39 percent of gun-related murders. This ratio is only growing: In 2011 there were record highs of gun violence in cities such as Chicago and Detroit. Plans to combat gun violence must include prevention programs and policies that target urban violence. 8. The cost of gun violence is a significant burden on the health care system. Firearm‐related injuries generally require hospitalization and significant emergency center resources. In 2005 U.S hospitals charged $108.4 million to care for about 10,000 victims of firearm injuries.

Countless children fall victim to accidents in the home – turns self-defense, **Walesh ‘83:**

Kim Walesh “Handguns In The Home: An Unnecessary Risk”

**Handguns make the home an easy target for accident**al death. The U.S. Surgeon General's 1981 Select Panel for the Promotion of Child Health proclaimed an "epidemic of [handgunrelated] deaths and injuries among children and youth." **One child dies every day from accidental shootings and perhaps thirteen more** are **injured.** In 1978 the U.S. had more killings with handguns by children ten years old and younger than Great Britain had by killers of all ages. 21 The problem is basic: **in order for a handgun to be useful, it must be kept loaded and handy** always. The danger is obvious. When curious children, careless adults, and easy-to-use handguns mix, **the result is horrifying accidental death.** One three-year-old boy carried a gun into the kitchen, asked, "Mommy, is this where I pull" and shot his stupefied mother. Another fourteen-year-old boy shot his fourteen-year-old friend after watching film clippings of the Reagan assassination attempt. The boys had gone exploring, looking for the gun in the basement. 22 Gun advocates argue that accidents happen only in careless homes. However, **as long as guns are so**. **readily available, children can kill parents and friends, as well as themselves**; safety classes and other precautions cannot prevent every accident. Ironically, the increasing number of guns bought to provide security and protection actually raises the"chances of more accidents, homicides, and self-destruction. The U.S. is an influential, respected world leader, and yet handguns continue slaughtering Americans and victimizing their relatives. Judging from our lack of concern and action, we Americans must need death in order to understand the value of life.

These mortality rates must be dealt with by decreasing availability – **Walesh 2:**

Handgun injury is a major cause of morbidity and mortality in American society, particularly among young people. **Large numbers of children are affected** by handgun violence through the loss of fathers, brothers, and other relatives. Young children are injured, and occasionally killed, in handgun “accidents”. Some young children and many adolescents are murdered with handguns. Like infant mortality, handgun violence in the United States is a medical as well as a social problem. Because of the great lethality of handguns and their very limited ability to provide personal protection, **handgun injury can best be reduced by making handguns less available.** Handgun control cannot reduce rates of crime or interpersonal assault, but it can reduce the frequency and severity of injury arising from these situations toward the much lower levels found in other countries. The involvement of children in the United States handgun injury epidemic warrants effective pediatrician involvement in efforts toward handgun control.

Psychological effects compound as well, **Walesh 3:**

**Handguns in the home have psychological as well as life-threatening effects** on children. Too often, people buy guns to protect their defenseless children without considering the many dangers. Many social scientists suggest that **guns make children feel powerless.** Instead of viewing the gun's presence as providing security, **the gun is seen as frightening.** As Rosalyn Weinman Schram, sociologist and consultant on matters of work and family, states, "**They**'re **get**ting **the message** that **their parents** really **can't take care of them, that they're intimidated** by crime **and not** very much **in control.**'' Dr. Martin Cohen, a New York City clinical psychologist, feels that **guns** actually **increase children's anxiety** levels. Children, perhaps more than adults, associate guns directly with violent behavior--a probable result of a rising number of assassination attempts as well as excessive television violence. Also, children may view the local police force, which has traditionally provided a sense of comfort and security,

as farcical at a time when more and more "protective" guns are brought into the home. Guns may also make our children more violent, as seen in the Berkowitz study. We stare in shock at photos of four-year-old children lifting machine guns in war-torn foreign countries. But we fail to understand that children learn mainly by imitating their parents. Guns, even if never used, are readily accepted by children because they are accepted, if not worshiped, by their parents. Guns in the home will **[they] increase** aggressive behavior and promote an **acceptance of violence** and guns **in future generations.**

This psychological damage traps minority youth, **Garbarino et al ‘02:**

http://futureofchildren.org/publications/journals/article/index.xml?journalid=42&articleid=166&sectionid=1068

**Exposure to gun violence can traumatize children and youth** not just physically, but emotionally as well. Studies have documented that young people exposed to gun violence experience lasting emotional scars. Some children may develop posttraumatic stress disorder **(PTSD**), which **can affect brain development**. The psychological trauma of gun violence may lead some children to arm themselves “for protection,” or desensitize them so that they feel less hesitation about engaging in violent acts. Psychological Impacts Associated with Exposure to Gun Violence Young people who are exposed to gun violence may experience negative psychological impacts **in both** the **short and long term.** For example, a recent study of rural third- through eighth-graders indicated that children exposed to gun violence reported significantly **higher levels of anger, withdrawal, and** posttraumatic **stress.**5 The problem is exacerbated when youth get caught in a cycle of violence: Those who witnessed at least one incidence of gun violence reported significantly greater exposure to other types of violence, higher levels of aggression, and less parental monitoring than their peers. 5 Exposure to gun violence also can desensitize youth to the effects of violence and increase the likelihood that they will use violence as a means of resolving problems or expressing emotions. Research shows that exposure to violence can cause intrusive thoughts about the traumatic event and sleep disturbances.6 Therefore, it is not surprising that children and youth exposed to gun violence commonly experience difficulty concentrating in the classroom, declines in academic performance, and lower educational and career aspirations.7,8 Other outcomes associated with exposure to violent trauma include **increased delinquency**, risky sexual behaviors, **and substance abuse**.7,8 Exposure to gun violence can cause children and youth to withdraw from the very people who may be best equipped to help them—friends and family. Researchers at the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) Trauma Psychiatry Program conduct interventions with young people who have sustained or witnessed violent injury. Their research suggests that exposure to gun violence affects the quality of youth friendships. For example, wounded adolescents are particularly focused on the physical scars resulting from their injuries because the scars are daily reminders of the trauma.8 These injuries can disrupt social relationships, because they often prompt questions from peers or even strangers about the event—questions that only perpetuate the distress. Victims or those exposed to violence often become estranged from friends who were with them during the trauma,8 because seeing people who were involved in the incident can remind them of it. Wounded and violence-exposed youth may experience other disruptions in their relationships with important peers and family members. Some young people experience survivor guilt after witnessing the violent victimization or death of a peer. Studies at UCLA indicate that many survivors and bystanders agonize during the event about whether to flee from the danger in self-preservation or to stay to aid their victimized friend. Memories of this dilemma can be extremely distressing. Furthermore, bystanders’ actions can affect their subsequent relationship with the victim, because many victims report feeling angry when bystanders and friends do not intervene.8 internal representation” of the trauma. Recurrent exposure to the trauma strengthens this response and lowers the child’s ability to deal with any type of trauma. The child’s brain becomes highly sensitive to threat and trauma-related cues, which in turn can affect his or her emotional and psychological wellbeing.11 Several studies have documented that children with a history of trauma develop a persistent, low-level fear, and respond to threats either with dissociation (separating certain ideas or emotions from the rest of their mental activity to avoid stress or anxiety) or with an unusually heightened state of arousal.11,12 This pattern of brain activity may also affect children’s general information processing.13 For example, children who have experienced trauma may misinterpret ambiguous stimuli as threatening. **Children do not have to witness gun violence directly to develop symptoms of traumatic stress.** After hearing about incidences of gun violence or learning about them on television, children may feel that their safety is threatened.14 Teens may respond to this threat by adopting what they perceive as “protective behaviors,” such as joining a gang or arming themselves with guns or knives.15 Many youth associate great power with carrying or having access to a gun.

The “weapons effect” means that the mere presence of handguns perpetuates this culture and causes children to become aggressive. Limiting ownership is key, **Walesh 4:**

Leonard Berkowitz, professor of psychology at the University of Wisconsin, first discovered this "weapons effect" in 1967. He hypothesized that **the presence of a gun would stimulate aggressive behavior.** The original research design placed subjects individually, in rooms with electric shock machines and made them judge lists of new ideas by delivering shocks to their partners who originated the idea. For some students there was nothing else in the room; for others, there were badminton rackets and shuttlecocks (neutral stimuli); and for the last group, there was a 12-guage shotgun and a snub-nosed .38 revolver. As predicted, students in the rooms with the guns shocked their partners longer and harder. Berkowitz concluded that “the mere sight of a weapon can be a conditioned stimulus that evokes ideas and motor responses associated with aggression." Later **studies** at the University of Utah **applied the** weapons effect **theory to child aggression.** Charles Turner and Diane Goldsmith observed the behavior of four and five year-olds in play sessions for several weeks. On some days the children played with neutral toys, such as airplanes, and on other days they played with toy guns. **When** the **children play**ed **with [toy] guns, there was a higher rate of** anti-social behavior (**pushing, hitting, name-calling**) than on the neutral toy '' "' days. The children had probably associated the guns with aggression and had acted violently as society had taught them. Berkowitz feels that **we** often **act mindlessly and impulsively in the presence of guns** and suggests that **the only way to control the** weapons **effect is to decrease** the **availability** of guns. 14 If the presence of guns does indeed create aggression, we may not have as much control over our actions as the classic NRA argument might suggest •

### Part II is the Advocacy I defend the resolution as a general principle. I reserve the right to clarify the AC and/or grant specifications in CX to prevent misunderstandings so I meet a theory or T interpretation unless the neg asks me to comply with it and I refuse – prevents the neg from reading unfair binary interps that moots my AC, skewing my time, and destroys substantive education.

The aff decreases gun ownership and violence, **Donohue:**

Donohue, John. "Ban Guns, End Shootings? How Evidence Stacks up - CNN.com." *CNN*. Cable News Network, 27 Aug. 2015. Web. 06 Jan. 2016. <http://www.cnn.com/2015/08/27/opinions/us-guns-evidence/>. ZP

The National Rifle Association (NRA), it seems, has so much power over politicians that even when 90% of Americans (including a majority of NRA members) wanted universal background checks to be adopted following the Newtown killings of 2012, no federal action ensued. Certainly, it's unlikely that any useful legislation will emerge in South Carolina. The NRA stranglehold on appropriate anti-crime measures is only part of the problem, though. The gun culture's worship of the magical protective capacities of guns and their power to be wielded against perceived enemies -- including the federal government -- is a message that resonates with troubled individuals from the Santa Barbara killer, who was seeking vengeance on women who had failed to perceive his greatness, to the Charleston killer who echoed the Tea Party mantra of taking back our country.mI've been researching gun violence -- and what can be done to prevent it -- in the U.S. for 25 years. The fact is that **if** NRA claims about the efficacy of **guns** in **reduc[e]**ing **crime** were true, **the U.S. would have the lowest homicide rate** among industrialized nations **instead of the highest** homicide rate **(by a wide margin).** The U.S. is by far the world leader in the number of guns in civilian hands. The stricter gun laws of other "advanced countries" have restrained homicidal violence, suicides and gun accidents -- even when, in some cases, laws were introduced over massive protests from their armed citizens.The state of gun control in the U.S. Eighteen states in the U.S. and a number of cities including Chicago, New York and San Francisco have tried to reduce the unlawful use of guns as well as gun accidents by adopting laws to keep guns safely stored when they are not in use. Safe storage is a common form of gun regulation in nations with stricter gun regulations.nThe NRA has been battling such laws for years. But that effort was dealt a blow earlier this month when the U.S. Supreme Court -- over a strident dissent by Justices Thomas and Scalia -- refused to consider the San Francisco law that required guns not in use be stored safely. This was undoubtedly a positive step because hundreds of thousands of guns are stolen every year, and good public policy must try to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and children. The dissenters, however, were alarmed by the thought that a gun stored in a safe would not be immediately available for use, but they seemed unaware of how unusual it is that a gun is helpful when someone is under attack. For starters, **only the tiniest fraction** of victims of violent crime **are able to use a gun in their defense.** Over the period from 2007-2011, when roughly six million nonfatal violent crimes occurred each year, data from the National Crime Victimization Survey show that the victim did not defend with a gun in 99.2% of these incidents -- this in a country with 300 million guns in civilian hands. In fact, a study of 198 cases of unwanted entry into occupied single-family dwellings in Atlanta (not limited to night when the residents were sleeping) found that **the invader was twice as likely to obtain the victim's gun than** to have **the victim use a firearm in self-defense.** The author of the study, Arthur Kellerman, concluded in words that Justice Thomas and Scalia might well heed: On average, the gun that represents the greatest threat is the one that is kept loaded and readily available in a bedside drawer. A loaded, unsecured gun in the home is like an insurance policy that fails to deliver at least 95% of the time you need it, but has the constant potential -- particularly in the case of handguns that are more easily manipulated by children and more attractive for use in crime -- to harm someone in the home or (via theft) the public at large. More guns won't stop gun violence For years, the NRA mantra has been that allowing citizens to carry concealed handguns would reduce crime as they fought off or scared off the criminals. Some early studies even purported to show that so-called **right to carry laws** (RTC) did just that, buta 2004 report from the National Research Council refuted that claim (saying it was not supported by "the scientific evidence"), while remaining uncertain about what the true impact of RTC laws was. Ten years of additional data have allowed new research to get a better fix on this question, which is important since the NRA is pushing for a Supreme Court decision that would allow RTC as a matter of constitutional law. The new research on this issue from my research team at Stanford University has given the most compelling evidence to date that [right to carry] laws **are associated with significant increases in violent crime** -- particularly for aggravated assault. Looking at Uniform Crime Reports data from 1979-2012, we find that, on average, the 33 states that adopted RTC laws over this period experienced violent crime rates that are 4%-19% higher after 10 years than if they had not adopted these laws. This hardly makes a strong case for RTC as a constitutional right. At the very least more research is needed to estimate more precisely exactly how much violent crime such a decision would unleash in the states that have so far resisted the NRA-backed RTC laws. In the meantime, can anything make American politicians listen to the preferences of the 90% on the wisdom of adopting universal background checks for gun purchases? Gun control around the world As an academic exercise, one might speculate whether law could play a constructive role in reducing the number or deadliness of mass shootings. Most other advanced nations apparently think so, since they make it far harder for someone like the Charleston killer to get his hands on a Glock semiautomatic handgun or any other kind of firearm (universal background checks are common features of gun regulation in other developed countries). • Germany: To buy a gun, anyone under the age of 25 has to pass a psychiatric evaluation (presumably 21-year-old Dylann Roof would have failed). • Finland: Handgun license applicants are only allowed to purchase firearms if they can prove they are active members of regulated shooting clubs. Before they can get a gun, applicants must pass an aptitude test, submit to a police interview, and show they have a proper gun storage unit. • Italy: To secure a gun permit, one must establish a genuine reason to possess a firearm and pass a background check considering both criminal and mental health records (again, presumably Dylann Roof would have failed). • France: Firearms applicants must have no criminal record and pass a background check that considers the reason for the gun purchase and evaluates the criminal, mental, and health records of the applicant. (Dylann Roof would presumably have failed in this process). • United Kingdom and Japan: Handguns are illegal for private citizens. While mass shootings as well as gun homicides and suicides are not unknown in these countries, the overall rates are substantially higher in the United States than in these competitor nations. While NRA supporters frequently challenge me on these statistics saying that this is only because "American blacks are so violent," it is important to note that white murder rates in the U.S. are well over twice as high as the murder rates in any of these other countries. Australia hasn't had a mass shooting since 1996 The story of Australia, which had 13 mass shootings in the 18-year period from 1979 to 1996 but none in the succeeding 19 years, is worth examining.[The turning point was the 1996 Port Arthur massacre](http://edition.cnn.com/2015/06/19/world/us-australia-gun-control/) in Tasmania, in which a gunman killed 35 individuals using semiautomatic weapons. In the wake of the massacre, the conservative federal government succeeded in implementing tough new gun control laws throughout the country. A large array of weapons were banned -- including the Glock semiautomatic handgun used in the Charleston shootings. The government also imposed a mandatory gun buy back that substantially reduced gun possession in Australia. The effect was that both gun suicides and homicides (as well as total suicides and homicides)fell. In addition, the 1996 legislation made it a crime to use firearms in self-defense. When I mention this to disbelieving NRA supporters they insist that crime must now be rampant in Australia. In fact, the Australian murder rate has fallen to close to one per 100,000 while the U.S. rate, thankfully lower than in the early 1990s, is still roughly at 4.5 per 100,000-- over four times as high. Moreover, robberies in Australia occur at only about half the rate of the U.S. (58 in Australia versus 113.1 per 100,000 in the U.S. in 2012). How did Australia do it? Politically, it took a brave prime minister to face the rage of Australian gun interests. John Howard wore a bullet-proof vest when he announced the proposed gun restrictions in June 1996. The deputy prime minister was hung in effigy. But Australia did not have a domestic gun industry to oppose the new measures so the will of the people was allowed to emerge. And today, support for the safer, gun-restricted Australia is so strong that going back would not be tolerated by the public. **That Australia hasn't had a mass shooting since 1996 is likely more than** merely **the result of the** considerable **reduction in guns** -- it's certainly not the case that guns have disappeared altogether. I suspect that the country has also experienced a cultural shift between the shock of the Port Arthur massacre and the removal of guns from every day life as they are no longer available for self-defense and they are simply less present throughout the country. Troubled individuals, in other words, are not constantly being reminded that guns are a means to address their alleged grievances to the extent that they were in the past, or continue to be in the US.

Comparative statistical analyses indicate the aff prevents cycles of violence, **Boseley:**

http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/sep/18/gun-ownership-gun-deaths-study

Guns do not make a nation safer, say US doctors who have compared the rate of firearms-related deaths in countries where many people own guns with the death rate in countries where gun ownership is rare. Their findings, published Wednesday in the prestigious [American Journal of Medicine](http://www.amjmed.com/), debunk the historic belief among many people in the United States that guns make a country safer, they say. On the contrary, the US, with the most guns per head in the world, has the highest rate of deaths from firearms, while Japan, which has the lowest rate of gun ownership, has the least. The journal has fast-tracked publication of the study because of the shootings at the Washington navy yard. It was originally scheduled for later this week. It follows an emotional appeal from a doctor at the trauma center in Washington where the victims of Aaron Alexis' random violence were taken. "I would like you to put my trauma center out of business," Janis Orlowski, chief medical officer at MedStar Washington Hospital Center, told reporters in the aftermath of the massacre. "I would like to not be an expert on gunshots. Let's get rid of this. This is not America." The fraught question of whether gun ownership protects populations from crime or makes them less likely to be killed has been debated for 200 years, say the authors, Sripal Bangalore of NYU Langone Medical Center, and Franz H Messerli of St Luke's Roosevelt hospital, Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York. They say the arguments began as soon as the second amendment stating "A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed" was passed in 1791. At one end is the argument that gun control laws are an infringement on the right to self-defense and on constitutional rights, and that there is no evidence that banning assault weapons would reduce crime. At the other end is the view that fewer firearms would reduce crime rates and overall lead to greater safety, they say. In some of the recent mass shootings – for instance those in Aurora, Tucson, Oak Creek, Virginia Tech – it has been suggested that the killer was mentally ill and that lack of treatment was a bigger issue than gun ownership. With this in mind, the New York-based doctors looked in their study not only at the relationship of gun ownership to firearms deaths but also mental illness. They examined data from 27 developed countries, using gun ownership figures from the Small Arms Survey and deaths from the World Health Organisation, the National Center for [Health](http://www.theguardian.com/society/health) Statistics and others. They also looked at crime rates compiled by the United Nations for an indication of the safety of each country. More guns meant more deaths, they found. "The **gun ownership rate was a strong and independent predictor of firearm-related death,"** says Bangalore. "Private gun ownership was highest in the US. Japan, on the other end, had an extremely low gun ownership rate. Similarly, South Africa (9.4 per 100,000) and the US (10.2 per 100,000) had extremely high firearm-related deaths, whereas the United Kingdom (0.25 per 100,000) had an extremely low rate of firearm-related deaths. "There was a significant correlation between guns per head per country and the rate of firearm-related deaths with Japan being on one end of the spectrum and the US being on the other. This argues against the notion of more guns translating into less crime. South Africa was the only outlier in that the observed firearms-related death rate was several times higher than expected from gun ownership." High rates of mental illness in any country, on the other hand, did not predict more gun deaths. "Although correlation is not the same as causation, it seems conceivable that **abundant** gun **availability facilitates** firearm-related **death**s**. Conversely, high crime rates** may **instigate widespread anxiety and fear**, thereby **motivating people to arm themselves** and give rise to increased gun ownership, which, in turn, increases availability. **The resulting vicious cycle could**, bit by bit, **lead to the polarized status that is now the case with the US,"** the doctors write. "Regardless of exact cause and effect, the current study debunks the widely quoted hypothesis that countries with higher gun ownership are safer than those with low gun ownership."

Gun laws spill over to change cultural assumptions that cause gun violence – we can end these self-continuing cycles, **LaFollette, 2k:**

Gun Control\* Hugh LaFollette Ethics, vol, 110 (2000), pp. 263-81

**The** strong **correlation between** the presence of **guns and a higher murder rate is** compelling. Since the correlation is statistically **significant** to a .01 level, it is difficult to believe that limiting private gun ownership will not have a noticeable effect on the numbers of murders. Gun advocates disagree: they claim that cultural factors explain the correlation. Although I think they are partly correct, they draw the wrong inference. For **one** crucial **difference between European and American cultures is the** widespread **presence of guns. Each culture is the way it is,** at least in part, **because of the role of guns** (or their absence) played in its creation and maintenance. **Therefore, curtailing** the **private possession** of guns **might well change** the **American culture so that it would be less violent**. Consequently, it is not only that **fewer guns** would directly cause some decline in violent crimes—which it should. It is also likely to **reshape** the **cultural values** which, along with the ready availability of deadly weapons, led to such an extraordinarily high murder rate in America.

A ban on handguns would force the gun industry to adapt to a changing market, decreasing all production overall, **Fendrock:**

**U.S. Firearms are produced by 5,400 licensed manufacturers**. 40% are sold by unlicensed private sellers. In addition, as of October, 2012 according to the Bureau of Tobacco, Firearms and Explosive records, there were 50,812 federally licensed gun dealers in the United States. These statistics gives an overview of the size of industry and business supporting and profiting from the production and distribution of firearms in the United States. The accuracy of some of the numbers may be questioned by reasonable individuals but it is clear that this activity employs thousands of people and supports a large number of businesses – manufacturing and marketing/sales activities. **Restricting** the **possession of firearms would have a** serious – **fatal** in many cases – **effect on the**se activities. The lucrative **American market** would be closed **except for the legitimate needs of the government** to replace obsolete arms used by the federal, state and municipal law enforcement agencies or to support the Federal government to outfit a growth in the military to meet a perceived threat against the country. If necessary the government could support certain companies in maintaining production capability within their facilities. **Companies that found themselves unable to compete in the limited market** in sales to the tightly controlled hunting and sport shooting **would have to adapt their skills and facilities to producing goods for the electro-mechanical needs of industries such as automotive communication, industrial equipment and similar industries.** In short, **they would have to adapt their activities to a changing market or close shop.**

### Part III is the Framework

The Role of the Judge is to be a critical educator concerned with protecting disadvantaged children. The judge’s endorsement of positions that attempt to liberate oppressed adolescents through the ballot is crucial. **Darder:[[1]](#footnote-1)**

The fundamental commitment of **critical educators** is to **empower the powerless and transform** those **conditions which perpetuate** human **injustice** and inequity (McLaren, 1988).  This purpose is inextricably linked to the fulfillment of what Paulo Freire (1970) defines as our "vocation" - to be truly humanized social agents in the world.  Hence, a major function of critical pedagogy is to **[and] critique**, expose, and challenge **the manner in which schools impact** upon the political and cultural life of **students**.  Teachers must recognize how schools unite knowledge and power and how through this function they can work to influence or thwart the formation of critically thinking and socially active individuals. **Unlike traditional perspectives of education that claim to be neutral** and apolitical, **critical pedagogy views all education** theory **as intimately linked to ideologies shaped by power**, politics, history and culture.  Given this view, schooling functions as a terrain of ongoing struggle over what will be accepted as legitimate knowledge and culture.  In accordance with this notion, a **critical pedagogy must** seriously address the concept of cultural politics by both legitimizing and **challeng[e]**ing cultural experiences that comprise the **histories and social realities** that in turn comprise the forms and boundaries that give meaning to student lives.

In the status quo, policymakers and individuals largely ignore children’s oppression. This makes the AC’s position crucial. Children need advocates within institutions to address the protection of their rights. **Godwin:**[[2]](#footnote-2)

While **childhood** similarly marks a stage of life that each of us will pass through, it **is[,] unlike old age**, **excluded from the consideration in the majoritarian process.** While all **adult voters** were once children, they **will not become children again** at some point in the future **so they need not worry about the legal disadvantages of children** being applied to them, whereas adults anticipate becoming elderly and therefore have a self-preservation motive to prevent discrimination against the elderly. Another obvious difference is simply that the elderly, unlike children, can vote, and in practice they vote disproportionately. **Children are** also **de facto denied the right to assemble**: **their ability to travel to demonstrations** or to political meetings **can be restricted by their parents and** truancy **laws,** with the state ready to use its police power to enforce parental authority if necessary. **Access to the media** **is** further **curtailed** not only because children lack the financial means to popularize their views but because they lack the legal rightsto have the opportunity to acquire those means.

The oppression of children because of their perceived status of inferiority makes the AC a crucial starting point for discussion; our voices must be heard. **Godwin 2:**

The first hurdles to overcome are the social **[I]ngrained assumptions about** the basic nature of **children and the** false necessity of the **legal social disadvantages** thought to naturally follow. I will argue instead that those legal disadvantages **constitute socially and political contingent policy choices**. **The inferior legal status of children is** often taken to be natural as it is **assumed to be a** direct and necessary **result of their inferior mental capacities**. Far from being demeaning or exploitive, children’s lack of an equal right to liberty and equality under the law is aid to protect them and enable proper development. **Since** these **legal disadvantages are socially constructed as protective** **of children** or arising from childhood innocence, **they escape the critical scrutiny** that identical disadvantages would draw if applied to other groups.

Our oppression is no better; rhetoric used in oppression of children has been used in similar cases that justify eugenics, racism, sexism etc. **Godwin 3:**

**Today, the subordination of children** to adults in general and their parents in particular **is** similarly seen as both being caused and **[is] justified by children’s inferior mental faculties**. Both **the paternalism argument** (children must be subordinate for their own good) **and the social necessity argument** (children must be subordinate for the good of society) **are advanced to support the legal disabilities of children.** **The parallels with “scientific racism’ and sexist neurological theories should be obvious**: we are frequently hold that children and adolescents are mentally inferior due to the underdeveloped brains, and this inferiority renders them incapable of behaving rationally or responsibly; in the past, precisely the same claims were advanced against women and black people.”

Critiquing children’s oppression and problematizing their current status is a key first step in engaging in critiques of other social institutions. This makes the AC a prerequisite. **Godwin 4:**

However I believe that **before more** radical **approaches to children’s status will be** widely **considered,** **it is first necessary to problematize the status of children from within existing liberal thinking** on legal rights. Just as second and third wave feminists were able to challenge women’s social roles and question the applicability of basic liberal thought on gender only after the suffragettes won basic legal rights- while **children’s** legally codified **oppression is** almost universally **regarded as unproblematic[.]**, **we must delegitimize** **this prevailing legal regime before we can debate more complex social questions.**

Putting abstract theories on a pedestal is a tool by the privileged to distance the discussion from oppression, **Matsuda**[[3]](#footnote-3)

The multiple consciousness I urge lawyers to attain is not a random ability to see all points of **view**, but a deliberate choice to see **the world from the standpoint of the oppressed.** That world is ac- cessible to all of us. We should know it in its con- crete particulars. We should know of our sister carrying buckets of water up five flights of stairs in a welfare hotel, our sister trembling at 3 a.m. in a shelter for battered women, our sisters holding bloodied children in their arms in Cape Town, on the West Bank, and in Nicaragua. The jurisprudence of outsiders teaches that these details and the emotions they evoke are relevant and important as we set out on the road to justice. These details are accessible to all of us, of all genders and colors. We can choose to know the lives of others by reading, studying, listening, and ventur- ing into different places. For lawyers, our pro bono work may be the most effective means of ac- quiring a broader consciousness of oppression. ¶ **Abstraction and detachment are ways out of the discomfort of direct confrontation with the ugliness of oppression. Abstraction**, criticized by both feminists and scholars of color, is the, method that **allows theorists to discuss** liberty, property, and **rights** in the aspirational mode of liberalism **with no connection to what those concepts mean in real people's lives.** Much in our **mainstream intellectual training values abstraction and denigrates nitty-gritty detail.** Holding on to a multiple consciousness will allow us to op- erate both within the abstractions of standard jurisprudential discourse, and within the details of our own special knowledge.¶ Whisperings at Yale and elsewhere about how deconstructionist heroes were closet fascists remind me of how important it is to stay close to oppressed communities**. High talk about** language, **meaning,** sign, process, and law **can mask** racist and sexist **ugliness** if we never stop to ask: "Exactly what are you talking about and what is the implication of what you are saying for my sis- ter who is carrying buckets of water up five flights of stairs in a welfare hotel? What do you propose to do for her today, not in some abstract future you are creating in your mind?" If you have been made to feel, as I have, that such inquiry is theo- retically unsophisticated, and quaintly naive, re- sist! Read what Professor Williams, Professor Scales-Trent, and other feminists and people of color are writing.' **The reality and detail of oppression are a starting point for** these writers as they enter into mainstream debates about law and **theory.**

**Critical pedagogy** necessitates focus on strategies to solve for oppression – the res is a starting point for teaching students to make power accountable, **Giroux:[[4]](#footnote-4)**

“Higher **education must be** understood as **a democratic** public **sphere** - a space in **which** education **enables students to** develop a keen sense of prophetic justice, **claim their** moral and political **agency,** utilize critical analytical skills, **and cultivate an ethical sensibility through which they learn to respect the rights of others.** Higher **education has a responsibility** not only to search for the truth regardless of where it may lead, but also **to educate students to make authority and power** politically and morally **accountable** while at the same time sustaining a democratic, formative public culture. Higher education may be one of the few public spheres left where knowledge, values and learning offer a glimpse of the promise of education for nurturing public values, critical hope and a substantive democracy. Democracy places **civic demands** upon its citizens, and such demands **point to the necessity of an education that is** broad-based, **critical**, and supportive of meaningful civic values, participation in self-governance, and democratic leadership. Only through such a formative and critical educational culture can **students** learn how to become individual and social agents, **rather than** merely **disengaged spectators, [must]** able both to think otherwise and to act upon civic commitments that **demand a reordering of** basic **power arrangements** fundamental to promoting the common good and producing a meaningful democracy.

We have to at least try to break these chains of oppression otherwise we will inevitably allow for a morally bankrupt system to continue**.** Debate needs to engage with solutions to material problems. Focus on ideal worlds or general theory is an abstraction that’s just intellectual gymnastics used by the privileged to escape hard conversations, perpetuating real oppression; judges need to take responsibility. **Smith:**

Elijah Smith http://victorybriefs.com/vbd/2013/9/a-conversation-in-ruins-race-and-black-participation-in-lincoln-douglas-debate

It will be uncomfortable, it will be hard, and it will require continued effort but the necessary step in fixing this problem, like all problems, is the community as a whole admitting that such a problem with many “socially acceptable” choices exists in the first place. Like all systems of social control, **the reality of racism in debate is constituted by** the singular **choices that institutions, coaches, and students make** on a weekly basis. I have watched countless rounds where **competitors** attempt to win by **rush**ing **to abstractions to distance the conversation from the material reality** that **black debaters are forced to deal with** every day. One of the students I coached, who has since graduated after leaving debate, had an adult judge write out a ballot that concluded by “hypothetically” defending my student being lynched at the tournament. Another debate concluded with a young man defending that we can kill animals humanely, “just like we did that guy Troy Davis”. **Community norms** would **have competitors do intellectual gymnastics** or make up rules to accuse black debaters of breaking **to escape hard conversations** but as someone who understands that experience, **the only constructive strategy is to acknowledge the reality of the oppressed**, engage the discussion from the perspective of authors who are black and brown, and then find strategies to deal with the issues at hand. It hurts to see competitive seasons come and go and have high school students and judges spew the same hateful things you expect to hear at a Klan rally. **A student should not**, when presenting an advocacy that aligns them with the oppressed, **have to justify why oppression is bad.** Debate is not just a game, but a learning environment with liberatory potential. Even if the form debate gives to a conversation is not the same you would use to discuss race in general conversation with Bayard Rustin or Fannie Lou Hamer, that is not a reason we have to strip that conversation of its connection to a reality that black students cannot escape. Current coaches and competitors alike **dismiss[ing] concerns of** racism and **exclusion, won’t teach** other **students anything** about identity in debate **other than how to** shut down competitors who engage in alternative styles and discourses, and **refuse to engage in those discussions even outside of a tournament setting.**

### Part IV is the Underview

1. A focus on abstract theorizing instead of coming up with actual concrete proposals that engage the material world is infinitely regressive and ensures that nothing gets done. **Bryant[[5]](#footnote-5):**

I would love, just for a moment, to hear a radical environmentalist talk about his ideal high school that would be academically sound. How would he provide for the energy needs of that school? How would he meet building codes in an environmentally sound way? How would she provide food for the students? What would be her plan for waste disposal? And most importantly, how would she navigate the school board, the state legislature, the federal government, and all the families of these students? What is your plan? What is your alternative? I think there are alternatives. I saw one that approached an alternative in Rotterdam. If you want to make a truly revolutionary contribution, this is where you should start. Why should anyone even bother listening to you if you aren’t proposing real plans? But we haven’t even gotten to that point. Instead we’re like underpants gnomes, saying “revolution is the answer!” without addressing any of the infrastructural questions of just how revolution is to be produced, what alternatives it would offer, and how we would concretely go about building those alternatives. Masturbation. “Underpants gnome” deserves to be a category in critical theory; a sort of synonym for self-congratulatory masturbation. We need less critique not because critique isn’t important or necessary– it is –but because we know the critiques, we know the problems. We’re intoxicated with critique because it’s easy and safe. We best every opponent [and] with critique. We occupy a position of moral superiority with critique. But do we really do anything with critique? What we need today, more than ever, is composition or carpentry. Everyone knows something is wrong. Everyone knows this system is destructive and stacked against them. Even the Tea Party knows something is wrong with the economic system, despite having the wrong economic theory. None of us, however, are proposing alternatives. Instead we prefer to shout and denounce. Good luck with that.

#### 2. Even if the state is bad, the state as a heuristic is a powerful learning tool for liberation.

Zanotti 14 (Dr. Laura Zanotti is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Virginia Tech. Her research and teaching include critical political theory as well as international organizations, UN peacekeeping, democratization and the role of NGOs in post-conflict governance.“Governmentality, Ontology, Methodology: Re-thinking Political Agency in the Global World” – Alternatives: Global, Local, Political – vol 38(4):p. 288-304, obtained via school library being awesome.)

While there are important variations in the way international relations scholars use governmentality theory, for the purpose of my argument I identify two broad trajectories. 2 One body of scholarship uses governmentality as a heuristic tool to explore modalities of local and international government and to assess their effects in the contexts where they are deployed; the other adopts this notion as a descriptive tool to theorize the globally oppressive features of international liberalism. Scholars who use governmentality as a heuristic tool tend to conduct inquiries based upon analyses of practices of government and resistance. These scholars rely on ethnographic inquiries, emphasizes the multifarious ways government works in practice (to include its oppressive trajectories) and the ways uneven interactions of governmental strategies and resistance are contingently enacted. As examples, Didier Bigo, building upon Pierre Bourdieu, has encouraged a research methodology that privileges a relational approach and focuses on practice; 3 William Walters has advocated considering governmentality as a research program rather than as a ‘‘depiction of discrete systems of power;’’ 4 and Michael Merlingen has criticized the downplaying of resistance and the use of ‘‘governmentality’’ as interchangeable with liberalism. 5 Many other scholars have engaged in contextualized analyses of governmental tactics and resistance. Oded Lowenheim has shown how ‘‘responsibilization’’ has become an instrument for governing individual travelers through ‘‘travel warnings’’ as well as for ‘‘developing states’’ through performance indicators; 6 Wendy Larner and William Walters have questioned accounts of globalization as an ontological dimension of the present and advocated less substantialized accounts that focus on studying the discourses, processes and practices through which globalization is made as a space and a political economy; 7 Ronnie D. Lipschutz and James K. Rowe have looked at how localized practices of resistance may engage and transform power relations; 8 and in my own work, I have studied the deployment of disciplinary and governmental tools for reforming governments in peacekeeping operations and how these practices were hijacked and resisted and by their targets. 9 Scholars who use governmentality as a descriptive tool focus instead on one particular trajectory of global liberalism, that is on the convergence of knowledge and scrutiny of life processes (or biopolitics) and violence and theorize global liberalism as an extremely effective formation, a coherent and powerful Leviathan, where biopolitical tools and violence come together to serve dominant classes or states’ political agendas. As I will show, Giorgio Agamben, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, and Sergei Prozorov tend to embrace this position. 10 The distinction between governmentality as a heuristic and governmentality as a descriptive tool is central for debating political agency. I argue that, notwithstanding their critique of liberalism, scholars who use governmentality as a descriptive tool rely on the same ontological assumptions as the liberal order they criticize and do move away from Foucault’s focus on historical practices in order to privilege abstract theorizations. By using governmentality as a description of ‘‘liberalism’’ or ‘‘capitalism’’ instead of as a methodology of inquiry on power’s contingent modalities and technologies, these scholars tend to reify a substantialist ontology that ultimately reinforces a liberal conceptualization of subjects and power as standing in a relation of externality and stifles the possibility of reimagining political agency on different grounds. ‘‘Descriptive governmentality’’ constructs a critique of the liberal international order based upon an ontological framework that presupposes that power and subjects are entities possessing qualities that preexist relations. Power is imagined as a ‘‘mighty totality,’’ and subjects as monads endowed with potentia. As a result, the problematique of political agency is portrayed as a quest for the ‘‘liberation’’ of a subject ontologically gifted with a freedom that power inevitably oppresses. In this way, the conceptualization of political agency remains confined within the liberal struggle of ‘‘freedom’’ and ‘‘oppression.’’ Even researchers who adopt a Foucauldian vocabulary end up falling into what Bigo has identified as ‘‘traps’’ of political science and international relations theorizing, specifically essentialization and ahistoricism. 11 I argue here that in order to reimagine political agency an ontological and epistemological turn is necessary, one that relies upon a relational ontology. Relational ontological positions question adopting abstract stable entities, such as ‘‘structures,’’ ‘‘power,’’ or ‘‘subjects,’’ as explanations for what happens. Instead, they explore how these pillar concepts of the Western political thought came to being, what kind of practices they facilitate, consolidate and result from, what ambiguities and aporias they contain, and how they are transformed. 12 Relational ontologies nurture ‘‘modest’’ conceptualizations of political agency and also question the overwhelming stability of ‘‘mighty totalities,’’ such as for instance the international liberal order or the state. In this framework, political action has more to do with playing with the cards that are dealt to us to produce practical effects in specific contexts than with building idealized ‘‘new totalities’’ where perfect conditions might exist. The political ethics that results from non-substantialist ontological positions is one that privileges ‘‘modest’’ engagements and weights political choices with regard to the consequences and distributive effects they may produce in the context where they are made rather than based upon their universal normative aspirations. 13

McMahan (i think we should frame this as an argument explaining why handguns wont actually contest state power, so the only real impact of handguns are the dentrimental effects they have on kids.)

One would think that if widespread gun ownership had the robust deterrent effects that gun advocates claim it has, our country would be freer of crime than other developed societies.  But it’s not.  When **most citizens are armed,** as they were in the Wild West, **crime doesn’t cease**.  Instead, **criminals work to be better armed, more efficient in their use of guns** (“quicker on the draw”), **and readier to use them.**When this happens, **those who get guns may be safer than they would be without them, but those without them become progressively more vulnerable.** Gun advocates have a solution to this: the unarmed must arm themselves.  But when more citizens get guns, further problems arise: people who would once have got in a fistfight instead shoot the person who provoked them; people are shot by mistake or by accident. And with guns so plentiful, any lunatic or criminally disposed person who has a sudden and perhaps only temporary urge to kill people can simply help himself to the contents of Mom’s gun cabinet.  Perhaps most important, **the more people there are who have guns, the less effective the police become**.  The power of the citizens and that of the police approach parity. **The police cease to have even a near-monopoly on the use of force.** To many devotees of the Second Amendment, this is precisely the point.  As former Congressman Jay Dickey, Republican of Arkansas, said in January 2011, “We have a right to bear arms because of the threat of government taking over the freedoms we have.”  The more people there are with guns, the less able the government is to control them. **But** if **arming the citizenry limits the power of the government,** it does so **by limiting the power of its agents,** such as the police. **Domestic defense becomes more a matter of private self-help and vigilantism and less a matter of democratically-controlled, public law enforcement. Domestic security becomes increasingly “privatized.”** There is, of course, a large element of fantasy in Dickey’s claim. **Individuals with handguns are no match for a modern army.  It’s also a delusion to suppose that the government in a liberal democracy such as the United States could become so tyrannical that armed insurrection,** rather than democratic procedures, **would be the best means of constraining it.**This is not Syria; nor will it ever be.  Shortly after Dickey made his comment, people in Egypt rose against a government that had suppressed their freedom in ways far more serious than requiring them to pay for health care. Although a tiny minority of Egyptians do own guns, the protesters would not have succeeded if those guns had been brought to Tahrir Square. If the assembled citizens had been brandishing Glocks in accordance with the script favored by Second Amendment fantasists, the old regime would almost certainly still be in power and many Egyptians who’re now alive would be dead. As more private individuals acquire guns, the power of the police declines, and personal security becomes a matter of self-help. **For the police to remain effective in a society in which** most of **those they** must **confront** or arrest **are armed, they must,** like criminals, **become better armed,** more numerous, and readier to fire. **But if they do that, guns won’t have produced a net reduction in the power of the government but will only have generated enormous private and public expenditures, leaving the balance of power between armed citizens and the state as it was before, the unarmed conspicuously worse off, and everyone poorer except the gun industry.**The alternative to maintaining the balance of power is to allow it to shift in favor of the armed citizenry and away from the police, again making unarmed citizens — including those who refuse on principle to contribute to the erosion of collective security by getting a gun — the greatest losers overall. **The logic is inexorable: as more private individuals acquire guns, the power of the police declines, personal security becomes more a matter of self-help, and the unarmed have an increasing incentive to get guns, until everyone is armed.** When most citizens then have the ability to kill anyone in their vicinity in an instant, everyone is less secure than they would be if no one had guns other than the members of a democratically accountable police force. The logic of private gun possession is thus similar to that of the nuclear arms race.  When only one state gets nuclear weapons, it enhances its own security but reduces that of others, which have become more vulnerable.  The other states then have an incentive to get nuclear weapons to try to restore their security.  As more states get them, the incentives for others increase.  If eventually all get them, the potential for catastrophe — whether through irrationality, misperception, or accident — is great.  Each state’s security is then much lower than it would be if none had nuclear weapons. Gun advocates and criminals are allies in demanding that guns remain in private hands.  They differ in how they want them distributed.  Criminals want guns for themselves but not for their potential victims.  Others want them for themselves but not for criminals.  But while gun control can do a little to restrict access to guns by potential criminals, it can’t do much when guns are to be found in every other household.  Either criminals and non-criminals will have them or neither will.  Gun advocates prefer for both rather than neither to have them. But, as with nuclear weapons, we would all be safer if no one had guns — or, rather, no one other than trained and legally constrained police officers. Domestic defense would then be conducted the way we conduct national defense.  We no longer accept, as the authors of the now obsolete Second Amendment did, that “a well-regulated militia” is “necessary to the security of a free state.”  Rather than leaving national defense to citizens’ militias, we now, for a variety of compelling reasons, cede the right of national defense to certain state-authorized professional institutions: the Army, Navy, and so on.  We rightly trust these forces to protect us from external threats and not to become instruments of domestic repression.  We could have the same trust in a police force designed to protect us from domestic threats. A prohibition of private ownership would not mean that no one could shoot guns. Guns for target shooting could be rented under security arrangements at the range. And there’s perhaps scope for debate about private possession of single chamber shotguns for hunting. Gun advocates will object that a prohibition of private gun ownership is an impossibility in the United States.  But this is not an objection they can press in good faith, for the only reason that a legal prohibition could be impossible in a democratic state is that a majority oppose it.  If gun advocates ceased to oppose it, a prohibition would be possible. They will next argue that even if there were a legal prohibition, it could not be enforced with anything approaching complete effectiveness.  This is true. **As long as some people somewhere have guns, some people here can get them.**  Similarly, **the legal prohibition of murder cannot eliminate murder.  But the prohibition of murder is more effective than a policy of “murder control”** would be. Guns are not like alcohol and drugs, both of which we have tried unsuccessfully to prohibit. Many people have an intense desire for alcohol or drugs that is independent of what other people may do. But the need for a gun for self-defense depends on whether other people have them and how effective the protection and deterrence provided by the state are. Thus, in other Western countries in which there are fewer guns, there are correspondingly fewer instances in which people need guns for effective self-defense.

**Frontlines**

### A/T Solvency Advocates Theory

A. Interpretation: Debaters may not exclude their opponent’s arguments based on a lack of carded warranting for them.

B. Violation: they say *that experts know more than debaters so I cannot read this position because I need a solvency advocates*/*etc.*

C. Standards:

1. **Decision-making**: Blindly listening to expert advice cripples our own judgment, precluding individual cost-benefit analysis, **Keim ‘09:**

**A brain-scanning study of people** making financial choices **suggests that when given expert advice, the decision-making parts of our brains often shut down.** The problem with this, of course, is that **the advice may not be good.** "When the expert's advice made the least sense, that's where we could see the behavioral effect," said study co-author Greg Berns, an Emory University neuroscientist. "It's as if people weren't using their own internal value mechanisms." Berns' specialty is neuroeconomics, a once-obscure field of research that's received heightened attention since the global economic slowdown left people at a loss to explain how the market's invisible hand picked their pockets. Of course, describing a few behavioral tendencies is no substitute for a detailed analysis of market deregulation, poorly conceived derivative contracts and all the other factors that fueled the slowdown. But studies like Berns', published Tuesday in Public Library of Science ONE, and another on hormones and day trading (testosterone is good for individual traders, but possibly bad for everyone else), have cast scientific doubt on a central tenet of free-market fundamentalism. Contrary to neoliberal economic theory, markets are not always driven by individuals acting rationally in their own best interests. "Many economists live in a peculiar world inhabited by other economists. It's called the world of rational decisionmaking," said Berns. "In this world, you take advice, integrate it with your own information, and come to a decision. If that were true, we'd have seen activity in regions that track decisions. But what we found is that when someone receives advice, those relationships went away." In the study, Berns' team hooked 24 college students to brain scanners as they contemplated swapping a guaranteed payment for a chance at a higher lottery payout. Sometimes the students made the decision on their own. At other times they received written advice from Charles Noussair, an Emory University economist who advises the U.S. Federal Reserve. Though the recommendations were delivered under his imprimatur, Noussair himself wouldn't necessarily follow it. The advice was extremely conservative, often urging students to accept tiny guaranteed payouts rather than playing a lottery with great odds and a high payout. But **students** tended to **follow** his **advice regardless of the situation**, especially when it was bad**. When thinking for themselves, students showed activity in** their anterior cingulate cortex and dorsolateral prefrontal cortex — **brain regions associated with making decisions and calculating probabilities. When given advice** from Noussair, **activity** in those regions **flat lined.**

They compound this problem with mandating solvency advocates – we’re equally capable of evaluating the validity of a plan. **Menand**

It is the somewhat gratifying lesson of Philip Tetlock’s new book, “Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?” (Princeton; $35), that **people who make prediction their business**—people who appear as experts on television, get quoted in newspaper articles, advise governments and businesses, and participate in punditry roundtables—**are no better than the rest of us. When they’re wrong, they’re rarely held accountable, and** they **rarely admit it**, either. They insist that they were just off on timing, or blindsided by an improbable event, or almost right, or wrong for the right reasons. They have the same repertoire of self-justifications that everyone has, and are no more inclined than anyone else to revise their beliefs about the way the world works, or ought to work, just because they made a mistake. No one is paying you for your gratuitous opinions about other people, but the experts are being paid, and Tetlock claims that the better known and more frequently quoted they are, the less reliable their guesses about the future are likely to be. **The accuracy of an expert**’s predictions actually **has an inverse relationship to** his or her **self-confidence,** renown, **and, beyond a certain point, depth of knowledge. People who follow current events by reading the papers** and newsmagazines regularly **can guess what is likely to happen about as accurately as the specialists** whom the papers quote. Our system of expertise is completely inside out: it rewards bad judgments over good ones.”[[6]](#footnote-6)

Inhibiting our own decision-making in round is the biggest impact to education. **Strait and Wallace:**

“Why debate? Some do it for scholarships, some do it for social purposes, and many just believe it is fun. These are certainly all relevant considerations when making the decision to join the debate team, but as debate theorists they aren’t the focus of our concern. Our concern is finding a framework for debate that educates the largest quantity of students with the highest quality of skills, while the same time preserving competitive equity. **The ability to make decisions** deriving **from discussions**, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It **is** the **one thing every single one of us will do every day of our lives** besides breathing. **Decision-making transcends** boundaries between **categories of learning** like “policy education” and “kritik education,” it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers, **and** it transcends **questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain.** The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is **the skills** we learn, **not the content** of our arguments, that **can best improve all our lives.** While **policy comparison skills** are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those skills **are useless if** they are **not grounded in the kind of logic actually used to make decisions.**

Further, their shell completely shuts us off from strategies to solve oppression. When we accept what we’re told and refuse to consider our own ingenuity, we can only reinforce the status quo – meaning their shell completely goes against my role of the ballot.

D. Voters: Education is a voter since it’s the terminal goal of debate and the reason schools fund it, so it’s a prerequisite to all benefits of the activity. Vote aff to discourage anti-educational practices and to foster critical thinking and decision-making skills in round. Since education is the only thing that lasts after we’re done competing, it’s important that we promote functional education and discourage actively harmful practices. [Crossapply drop the debater]

*This shell is not an offensive counterinterp because there are no arbitrary planks. The shell indicts your ability to read theory saying I can’t read certain arguments because I don’t have a solvency advocate. A counterinterp would justify why I can read a position without a solvency advocate, but the standards in my shell warrant why your having read theory is actively uneducational.*

#### A/T Their shell

[Read counterinterp]

**AT: Only a High Schooler:**

1. My metatheory shell turns this argument.

2. No link to a voter. This argument doesn’t matter.

**AT: Predictability**

1. No abuse. Predictability is not a real standard. There is no way to verify when certain arguments become predictable. Even if literature exists, it doesn’t mean you would have read that lit.

2. Disclosure solves all abuse. The plan is disclosed.

3. No abuse. Empirically denied, you can have blocks to common frameworks or theory arguments but they’re not in the topic lit.

4. Thinking of arguments in round forces critical thinking. Crossapply Strait and Wallace from my shell. Critical thinking is the most important link to education.

**AT: Ground**

1.This argument is patently false. The impact section is carded evidence about impacts happening now, so they’re not unrealistic.

2. No abuse, if my arguments only have a shred of a warrant, just point that out.

**AT: Topic Lit**

1. No abuse. Even if literature exists, it doesn’t mean you would have read that lit.

2. No abuse. Empirically denied, you can have blocks to common frameworks or theory arguments but they’re not in the topic lit.

3. Crossapply my metatheory shell. Extemped in round clash is good, instead of relying on blocks.

4. Experts making predictions are bad, so my shell controls the internal link into what topic lit matters.

**education outweighs fairness**

1. CX the last sentence of the voter. Education outweighs because it is the long term benefit to debate. Whereas fairness only helps us in the span of a tournament, education benefits us our entire lives. Moreover, fairness is only valuable in this hypothetical debate setting, while education is universally valuable.
2. Fairness only has instrumental value in achieving ends, but isn’t intrinsically valuable. Education provides an actual reason for an activity existing, as opposed to just being a possible useful feature of that activity. This comes before other voter arguments because if the activity is useless, there’s no reason to care about ruining it.
3. Although debate might be a game, it is still a scholastic game, schools fund it because it provides some value. Without that education debate would a) be pointless and indistinguishable from any other game and b) schools would stop funding debate and it would collapse.
4. All theory implicitly concedes a utilitarian calculus – it says the effects of the interps are what matter rather than some means based calculus. Under an ends based analysis, education always comes first since it has the largest impact on my life, while fairness impacts a round.
5. Fairness harms are non-unique– the round starts with one debater having more coaches, more teammates, different experiences different styles and having different backgrounds –in round actions have a tiny impact. This also functions as a **no abuse claim** on their shell, because my actions have no actual effect on the fairness/unfairness skew against him, thus, this nullifies their shell.
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